UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,787	09/28/2001	Tomoaki Endoh	35.C15845	3430

5514 7590 01/29/2008

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
DULANEY, BENJAMIN O	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/964,787	ENDOH, TOMOAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin O. Dulaney	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 September 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *5,9,24,28,39 and 41* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *5,9,24,28,39 and 41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/4/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to applicant's argument that neither Nishizawa nor Gecht teach determining whether a job can be deleted based upon decrypted user information, examiner disagrees. The purpose of Gecht in the current combination for claim 5 is merely to add encryption/decryption capability to a network printing system. While Nishizawa has a control unit for access determinations, it is not explicitly stated that printing signals are encrypted and then decrypted, hence the need for Gecht. Based on this obvious incorporation of a decrypting unit into the access control of Nishizawa, Nishizawa then teaches a determination of whether a job can be deleted or not based on user information (i.e. the read/write access determinations in Figure 3 of Nishizawa) in the decryption results.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1) Claims 5, 9, 24, 28, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,987,228 by Nishizawa, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,859,832 by Gecht et al.

2) Regarding claims 5, 24 and 39, Nishizawa teaches peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server on said network (Column 2, lines 31-40), comprising: receiving means for receiving a control command for a job from an information processing apparatus on said network (Column 3, lines 2-8; Figure 1); the access ticket being issued from the directory server (Column 4, lines 53-55; Figure 2); control means for limiting execution of said control command based on decryption results of said first decrypting means (Column 3, lines 2-8); the access ticket being issued from the directory server (Column 4, lines 53-55; Figure 2), wherein: in the case where said control command is one for deleting a specified job, said control means determines whether or not the job can be deleted based on user information included in the decryption results of said first decrypting means and user information included in the decryption results of said second decrypting means (Figure 3; Column 4, lines 47-50).

Nishizawa does not teach first decrypting means for decrypting an access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in said control command; second decrypting means for decrypting the access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in the job.

Gecht does teach decrypting means for decrypting an access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in said control command; second decrypting means for decrypting the access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in the job (Column 9, lines 4-8).

Nishizawa and Gecht are combinable because they are both from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nishizawa by Gecht to add encryption/decryption security. The motivation for doing so would have been for security because "it is very desirable to protect any proprietary or confidential information that may be embodied in the print jobs" (Column 9, lines 1-3). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Nishizawa with Gecht to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 24.

First and second decrypting means were not specified as separate and can therefore be the same means for decrypting.

3) Regarding claims 9, 28 and 41, Nishizawa teaches peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server on said network (Column 2, lines 30-32), comprising: obtaining means for logging in to said directory server based on information inputted from an operation panel and obtaining an access ticket of said peripheral equipment corresponding to the inputted information from said directory server (Column 2, lines 40-46); inputting means for, after obtaining said access ticket, inputting a control command for the Job from said operation panel (Column 2, lines 40-46); and control means for limiting execution of said control command based on decryption results of said first decrypting means (Column 3, lines 2-8); the access ticket being issued from the directory server (Column 4, lines 53-55; Figure 2), wherein: in the case where said control command is one for deleting a specified job, said control means determines whether or not the job can be deleted based on user information included in

the decryption results of said first decrypting means and user information included in the decryption results of said second decrypting means (Figure 3; Column 4, lines 47-50).

Nishizawa does not teach first decrypting means for decrypting said access ticket; and second decrypting means for decrypting the access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in the job.

Gecht does teach first decrypting means for decrypting said access ticket; and second decrypting means for decrypting the access ticket of said peripheral equipment included in the job (Column 9, lines 4-8).

Nishizawa and Gecht are combinable because they are both from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nishizawa by Gecht to add encryption/decryption security. The motivation for doing so would have been for security because "it is very desirable to protect any proprietary or confidential information that may be embodied in the print jobs" (Column 9, lines 1-3). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Nishizawa with Gecht to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9 and 28.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin O. Dulaney whose telephone number is (571) 272-2874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9am - 6pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Lamb can be reached on (571)272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TWYLER LAMB HARKINS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER